

**Planning Commission Hearing Minutes  
January 23, 2012**

PC MEMBERS	PC MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT
Meta Nash Josh Bokee Alderman Russell Elisabeth Fetting Rick Stup	Gary Brooks	Gabrielle Dunn-Division Manager of Current Planning Joe Adkins-Deputy Director for Planning Brandon Mark-City Planner Jeff Love-City Planner Devon Hahn-City Traffic Engineer Scott Waxter-Asst. City Attorney Carreanne Eyler-Administrative Assistant

**I. ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

---

**II. PUBLIC HEARING-SWEARING IN:**

*"Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the responses given and statements made in this hearing before the Planning Commission will be the whole truth and nothing but the truth." If so, answer "I do".*

---

**III. CONTINUANCES:**

- A. **PC11-496FSI-Final Site Plan, Worman's Mill Village Center**
- B. **PC11-494PSU-Preliminary Subdivision Plan-Worman's Mill Village Center**
- C. **PC11-495PFCP-Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan, Worman's Mill Village Center**

Mrs. Dunn stated that these cases were heard at the January 9, 2012 hearing and were intended to be scheduled for this evening's meeting however, due to the requirement that the property be posted 15 days prior to the hearing, they have to be delayed to the February 13, 2012. Staff is asking for a continuance of all three applications.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Stup moved to continue PC11-496FSI, PC11-494PSU and PC11-495PFCP to the February 13, 2012 hearing.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Fetting.

**VOTE:** 5-0.

---

**D. PC11-597FSI-Final Site Plan, Frederick Memorial Hospital**

**INTRODUCTION OF CASE BY THE PLANNING STAFF:**

Mr. Mark entered the entire staff report into the record. He stated that the applicant is requesting final site plan approval for a 31,622 square foot expansion of the existing parking deck to accommodate a net increase of 420 spaces.

The Applicant is also requesting the following modification to the Land Management Code (LMC):

- A modification to the Section 605(e), Table 605-3 for the property line screening requirements.

**INITIAL PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of a modification to Section 605(e), Table 605-3 for a Level I screening buffer for a property zoned IST abutting a property zoned IST based on the Applicants compensating feature of augmenting the existing screening.

Staff recommends approval of the architectural elevations as proposed for compliance with the building and urban design standards for the IST zoning district subject to the following conditions:

Staff recommends approval of Final Site Plan PC11-597FSI subject to the following conditions:

To be met in less than 60 days:

1. Note 29 on the site plan must be revised to indicate that no more than 250 cardholders will have access to the Park Avenue entrance/exit.
2. Note 30 on the site plan must be revised to indicate that the proposed percentage of storm water treated by non-structural practices from "(By micro-scale practices)" is 100%.
3. Note 30 on the site plan must be revised to indicate that ADT rate is 660.
4. The Applicant provides a note citing the date and section of the modification granted by the Planning Commission.
5. The Applicant completes Note 31 to label the Combined Forest Stand Delineation and Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan to PC11-804FSCB.

To be met in greater than 60 days and less than one year:

1. Pending the Planning Commission approval of PC11-804, the onsite forest conservation plan, the Applicant must receive unconditional approval for a Forest Stand Delineation and Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan, or combination thereof, for the offsite afforestation location.

**PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF STAFF:**

There was no questioning of staff from the Planning Commission.

**PRESENTATION OF THE CASE BY THE PETITIONER/APPLICANT OR HIS AGENT OR ATTORNEY:**

Mr. Rand Weinberg, Weinberg & Miller, stated that in the staff report there is one modification that has been requested and that is to the Level I screening requirements but that the only reason that modification is being requested is that as part of the site plan approved by the Planning Commission for the new gymnasium for Hood College, the hospital was asked to allow the Level I screening between the gym and the hospital property to be placed on FMH property. He added that there is not enough room to do a new Level I screening.

Mr. Weinberg stated that the site plan that has been submitted has met all the requirements of the Land Management Code (LMC). He stated that this project is proposed to have four access points, three of them on the west side of the garage and the fourth, a gated access point located on Park Avenue west of Elm Street. He added that FMH has a parking deficiency of over 400 spaces. The best solution for this is

to add on to the existing garage. He added that employees are being shuttled on and off campus all day long. The 400 spaces won't totally eliminate that but will take a big step in that direction. The deficiency renders hospital, as it is now, nonconforming under the LMC. Mr. Weinberg said they are trying to design this in a way to minimize the conflict between vehicular and pedestrian transportation. He stated that the site plan before the Planning Commission this evening complies with the LMC and has been recommended for approval by staff.

Mr. Weinberg stated that there is one significant item of dispute and that is the Park Avenue gate. The initial plan for the parking garage expansion called for the four access points that are shown on the plan but after significant discussion with staff and hearing from the neighbors at the NAC meeting, the hospital immediately began to studying how to address the concerns of the neighbors. Although, not the preference of FMH, a proposal was made by FMH where they would limit the use of the Park Avenue to no more than 250 round trips per day. He added that they agreed to install technology which would cap the number of inbound and outbound trips and upon reaching that threshold in either direction the gate will become nonfunctional for the balance of the 24 hour period. Additionally, the hospital has agreed that the Park Avenue gate will be accessed only by physicians and other professional staff and access through that gate will be controlled by an issuance of access cards. The only people who would be able to utilize the gate are those who are issued a card by FMH specifically for that gate.

Mr. Kleinhanzl, President and CEO of FMH, stated that parking is always a challenge. He stated that at FMH, the words substandard, inadequate and frustrating describe the current parking situation especially for the patients and visitors that seek care. He stated that they have a congested, busy, and crowded campus that requires immediate attention. He added that FMH has experienced tremendous growth in the past five years and significant investments have been made. He added they have added over 330 new employees and several dozen physicians to accommodate this growth and now employ over 2,800 people. Mr. Kleinhanzl stated that they had selected the proposed site for the garage expansion for several reasons. 1) it is the only remaining site on the campus that doesn't already have an existing building to work parking 2) it allows the existing garage's ramping to be used, saving costs 3) it is the only option that could address the parking shortage. He added the only immediate solution to the parking deficiency is to construct an addition to the existing garage and in doing so, the dysfunction of the current parking must be dealt with to create a parking experience for patients and visitors that flow freely, efficiently and safely. He stated that when the parking garage is complete it will house nearly 1,300 parking spaces. 75% of the cars that park on the campus will probably park within that garage. He feels this expansion project is long overdue.

Mr. Bob Geising, Trinity Health Care gave brief power point presentation on the expansion of the garage and why the Park Avenue entrance is essential for this project.

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF PETITIONER/APPLICANT:**

Commissioner Nash asked if the applicant considered the Montessori School traffic when doing the traffic counts.

Mr. Caloggero, The Traffic Group, stated yes, that when the traffic counts were conducted, they were conducted at the intersections of Elm & Dill Street as well as Elm Street and Park Avenue as requested by the City. So whatever trips are associated with the Montessori School would be included in those existing traffic counts.

Commissioner Fetting stated that it was mentioned that there were going to be 250 cards issued but then the case presented this evening was slightly different in that there may be more cards than that but they will stop at 250 trips through technology. She asked for confirmation.

Mr. Weinberg replied yes and that this is something they have been trying to figure out the best way to do. The intent always was to come up with a level of use for that gate and figure out the best way to get that level of use but limit it to that level. There are some problems with issuing 250 cards because half of those people might not work on a given day in which case, the gate would be utilized half as much as intended. He explained that this is a hybrid approach where there would be a strict limit of 250 and that they will do a survey of all the doctors, staff and other professionals that we would propose to issue a card to and see how many of them would be interested in using this gate and how often they think they would use it and start issuing cards. He noted that they know that they would have to issue at least 250 cards, but were not sure exactly how many.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Mr. Dave Severn, Severn, O'Conner & Kresslein, stated that he is representing Randy Knight. He stated that Randy is a resident of 267 Dill Avenue and has actively been involved with many of his neighbors monitoring the proposal from FMH. He said that Mr. Knight and his neighbors feel strongly in an effort to persuade the Planning Commission that there will be a negative impact not only on their quality of life and the safety of their streets, but also on their property values. Mr. Severn stated that the staff report cites an increase in traffic as a result of this expansion. He added that Mr. Knight is not resolute in his opposition to the pending garage expansion project. He did not oppose the hospital expansion plan before with the helipad, loading dock, however, with three points of access on Park Avenue they feel very strongly that a 4<sup>th</sup> access point, no matter how restricted, is too much for this small residential road and not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Severn stated that Mr. Knight supports the mission and the role of FMH, its value to the community and the necessity as well as the need to expand the parking deck. He also supports the hospital remaining in this location. Mr. Severn stated that Mr. Knight also supports the site plan except the portion of the site plan and the condition the staff has recommended and as proposed by the applicant, which is the restricted access. He said they have their own proposal for the access which they believe is fair, balanced and reasonable given the identified need that FMH has cited in their presentation. This modification and this alternative access were submitted last week in advance of the hearing. This plan was developed with a lot of input and discussion. It provides the access the hospital says it needs but only allows it to be used in the event that there is an emergency such as the hospital is concerned about addressing a blockage on 7<sup>th</sup> street. Mr. Severn questioned how an enforceable mechanism can be developed to impose as a condition on the site plan. He noted that this can be eliminated because the residents' proposal is to have an emergency access using permeable surface material and temporary curb ramps, but no curb cut onto Park Avenue, and removable bollards that would prevent someone from using it that wasn't going to obey signage. He feels this issue requires more of a comprehensive look and study. Mr. Severn stated that he would like the Planning Commission to approve the site plan with the alternate access as a modification as permitted under the LMC.

Lucia Hall of 336 Park Avenue stated that she supports urban infill growth such as what is proposed by FMH as long as it is responsibly managed to meet the vision for smart growth and walkable communities that have set forth in our City's Comprehensive Plan. She added that she is supportive of the FMH site plan and garage with the conditions outlined by Mr. Severn. She concluded by asking the Planning Commission to consider their proposed conditions and a suggested site plan as a viable alternative to the plan presented by FMH.

Anne Whong of 265 Dill Avenue stated that she supports FMH and the approval of the site plan but only with the conditions outlined by Mr. Severn because she believes the hospital does not need a third<sup>t</sup> entrance to the garage from Park Avenue that would be in permanent use.

Gabrielle Campbell of 304 Park Avenue supports FMH and the approval of the site plan but only with the conditions outlined by Mr. Severn. She feels that at the NAC meetings neighbors were not heard by FMH and the responses from them were vague, inconsistent, and misleading. The concern that was expressed by the neighbors was that there were no new vehicular access points on Park Avenue and this was not addressed by FMH.

Brian Slagle of 277 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street stated he supports the proposed garage expansion but only with the conditions outlined by Mr. Severn. He feels it important to look at the hospital's future intentions. He stated that in their master plan the team pointed out the key elements that would make Park Avenue a vital entrance in the future. As the campus develops the current main entrance on 7<sup>th</sup> Street will be obstructed by a large administration building that would permanently prevent cars from accessing the deck from this entrance.

John Freeman of 515 Elm Street stated that he supported the approval of the hospital plan but only with the conditions outlined by Mr. Severn. He feels that it closely approximates the City's vision of development as expressed in the Comprehensive Plan. The additional traffic that could be generated decreases the quality of life in the neighborhood, damages property values and safety. He concluded that they have proposed a practical solution to manage this by maintaining the boundary between the hospital and neighborhood, offering an emergency exit, and primarily routing traffic onto 7<sup>th</sup> Street.

Kim Grinev of 518 Elm Street stated that she supports FMH and the approval of the site plan but only with the conditions as outlined by Mr. Severn and believes the proposed conditions best address traffic flow issues.

Christina Stevenson of 512 Elm Street stated that she supports FMH and the approval of the site plan but only with the conditions as outlined by Mr. Severn because it keeps traffic on 7<sup>th</sup> Street which is designed to accommodate commercial and institutional traffic and it maintains the safety and quality of life of the residents in the surrounding community.

Aaron Forster of 513 Elm Street stated that he supports FMH and the approval of the site plan but only with the conditions as outlined by Dave Severn because he does not believe the traffic study appropriately illustrates the impact of traffic volume and flow in the neighborhood.

Katie House of 356 Park Avenue stated that she supports FMH and the approval of the site plan but only with the conditions outlined by Mr. Severn and feels it is important to limit the number of curb cuts on Park Avenue.

Dave Martin of 504 Elm Street stated that he loves Elm Street and the character that street brings. He added that he supports FMH and the approval of the site plan but only with the conditions supported by Mr. Severn. He feels safety is a big concern.

Darius Mark of 514 Elm Street stated that he supports FMH and the plan but only with the recommendations that Mr. Severn has mentioned which are factual, measurable, and enforceable and do meet the needs of the hospital.

Katie Slagle of 277 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street stated that she supports FMH and the approval of the FMH site plan but with the conditions as outlined by Mr. Severn because the community has clearly expressed their opposition to the proposed Park Avenue access point.

Christine Merry of 103 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street stated that she supports the FMH site plan but only with the modifications as outlined by Mr. Severn. She added that increased traffic would change the nature of the area and impact the safety of all the children.

Mark Pryzoboki of 501 Elm Street stated that he supports FMH and the approval of the site plan but only with the conditions as outlined by Mr. Severn and asked the Planning Commission to use the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Management Code tools and guidelines already in place to ensure each portion of FMH plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan while FMH does have a larger master plan that reflects the full development of the property.

Tim O'Boyle of 520 Elm Street stated that he supports the FMH site plan but with only the conditions at outlined by Mr. Severn. He added that by bringing more traffic into this neighborhood. This puts the welfare and safety of lives at risk as well.

Hunter Hughes of 257 Dill Avenue stated that there have been tests and studies done but they don't prove what actually happens on the streets. He feels that Rosemont and Dill Avenue are not made for heavy traffic and could be made if the City wants to make those types of adjustments. He noted that he doesn't support this unless it is with the conditions as referenced by Mr. Severn.

Jodi Vallaster of 354 Park Avenue stated that the fourth access point on Park Avenue is not needed for FMH to fulfill their mission and it will increase the traffic. She asked the Planning Commission to prioritize the safety and the needs of the community over the luxury of doctor's and staff and to only approve the plan with the provisions presented by the community.

Katie Martin of 119 Fairview Avenue stated that she is here to support the families in the surrounding neighborhood.

Ahna O'Shaughnessy of 521 Elm Street asked the Commission to consider the alternative plan brought by Mr. Severn. She feels it would make the whole neighborhood safer and it would make her and her husband's able to exit their driveway safely.

Harriet Wise of 242 Dill Avenue stated the traffic continues to increase and it gets harder to get by the intersection where the left hand turn on to Elm Street goes. She added that she supports all of her neighbors and the Severn plan.

Timothy Townsend of 311 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street supports the community and feels that it is not a traffic conflict with ambulances coming in on the 7<sup>th</sup> Street entrance and not going to have people obstructing an ambulance intentionally.

Malgorzata Schmidt of 244 Dill Avenue stated that FMH should identify more alternatives for employee commuters and operate a shuttle and feels that any employees who continue to drive to FMH should be charged a monthly fee. She added that they would like to see the public transport included on FMH's plan.

Janice Martin of 10724 Liberty Road and previously lived at 504 Elm Street stated that regarding the promise of 250 cards by the hospital administration, she is concerned that the promises made tonight will be forgotten by future administration and asked to keep the traffic going onto 7<sup>th</sup> Street.

**PETITIONER REBUTTAL:**

Mr. Weinberg stated that there is very little to dispute with this plan and the only real concern is the one entrance. He added that they wanted to have another meeting with the residents prior to the hearing and were advised by email that representatives of the neighbors would meet with them but only with the condition that prior to the meeting that they remove the Park Avenue gate/entrance from the plan. Mr. Weinberg didn't think that was appropriate and wanted to discuss that with them. He added that they wanted to talk with the neighbors about whether or not it would make a difference if they eliminated one of the existing access points from Park Avenue into the hospital but never had the opportunity to do that.

Mr. Kleinhanzl stated that he understands the concerns of the neighbors but it doesn't change the fact they have to decompress that corner of the campus. This is not just about safety but it is also about the patient experience and the free flow of access for people to come to the hospital for care. He stated that the hospital is firmly committed to the proposal that is presented. He added that the issue with parking is a here and now issue; it is a concern that people are impacted by every day. He noted that they are committed to the 250 cards but have to have the flexibility to maximize that in order to have the operational impact that are hoped for on the campus. In conclusion, he stated that they are committed to the proposal at hand.

Mr. Weinberg stated that there is a traffic study in the record. Devon Hahn, City Traffic Engineer, has approved the traffic study. It shows that every intersection has an acceptable level of service. He noted that they meet the requirements of the code in regards to the traffic. He said the hospital looked at the cap of 250 units and that they believe it will work and still function for the purposes it is designed for. Mr. Weinberg said that the LMC has been designed to control things such as congestion in the streets, secure public safety, health, general welfare and has been prepared in accordance with and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The plan that has been submitted is compliant with each section of the LMC. He added the hospital has to grow in order to continue to handle the increasing need for medical services. He concluded by stating they did look at the alternative plan and it didn't work. He stated that the hospital does not have an obligation to construct it in accordance with the alternative plan, but that their obligation is to design, build a plan and operate a facility that is compliant with the law and ordinances and ask that the Planning Commission to approve the plan as submitted with an appropriate note on the plan regarding limited access.

**PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FOR STAFF:**

Commissioner Nash asked if Mrs. Hahn could address the questions she emailed her regarding FMH.

Mrs. Hahn responded to the first question asking her to speak to the applicable regulations of phasing a project and how it affects the Traffic Impact Study. Mrs. Hahn stated she has met with the hospital on numerous occasions and they showed some concept plans they had for the north side of the hospital and that she had requested if that was to come to fruition that it be part of the traffic study. She added that she was asked to look at the application before us and that what was presented in the approved traffic study. With regards to the next question, "Did the traffic study include the recommended circulation pattern to Montessori School?" Mrs. Hahn responded that the traffic study analyzes the counts of what is already out there; that we typically study the peak hours of the adjacent street, however it is not necessarily the peak hour of the property that is generating the trips. If there was any Montessori School traffic during the peak hours they would have been captured in the existing count. She added that they may let out around 3 or 3:30 p.m. which while there may be some traffic issues and circulation items, we need to address that with them and she doesn't know if that is specifically the hospitals to fix. In regards to the last question, the proposed south access point is required to maintain continued access to the garage during construction

of the expansion and future development to north of the garage. How can the City evaluate the impact if no plans have been provided as to what this future growth entails? Mrs. Hahn stated she will have to defer to the Applicant to explain what they meant by that statement. As the presented, the traffic study analyzed the intersections that were requested and they operate adequately.

Commissioner Nash said it stated that they were going to use the Park Avenue access point during construction of the expansion of the deck and then it said properties north of entrance and didn't know if at such time construction did ensue, if there was some concept plan, if there intention was to use this entrance during that construction time.

Mrs. Hahn stated any addition that goes to the north would have to come back through this exact same process and the impacts to any nearby intersection would be evaluated at that time.

Commissioner Nash questioned if access is limited to 250, what is going to happen during garage construction.

Mr. Geising replied that during the construction of the garage the current access that is located on the north end is going to be eliminated.

Mr. Weinberg stated that during construction, the hospital will not be closing any entrances off of 7<sup>th</sup> Street. He also stated that they are limiting the access point at Park Avenue to 250 trips even during construction and that the first thing that will be installed would be the gate on that access point.

Commissioner Bokee asked what would trigger additional traffic studies if the hospital is looking at a multi-phase plan.

Mrs. Dunn stated that the zoning district and the type of development application that it is, for new construction, does not require any sort of master plan development. The application in front of Commission is what has been assessed in the traffic impact study because there is no mechanism to require long range plans or a concrete plan to propose at this time. She added that it is not a phased development and doesn't apply in this situation.

Commissioner Bokee asked if there is no requirement for a master plan because this is in the institutional overlay zone.

Mrs. Dunn responded that a master plan is required with some of the City's other zones or planning techniques.

Commissioner Nash said she has a concern along Hood Alley and asked if it was discussed in the traffic plan.

Mrs. Hahn replied that it has not been brought up in her discussions with residents but it is something that can be looked at.

Commissioner Nash asked what is done for traffic calming.

Mrs. Hahn replied that it could be a number of things, anything that narrows the road which it is pretty narrow already. She added that most people are familiar with speed bumps and there is any number of items for solutions.

Commissioner Fetting asked where the people are parking now; what is the current condition with the 400 spaces.

Mr. Weinberg stated there is valet parking and employees being shuttled to various offsite places. He also stated that the hospital believes that a lot of them are parking in the neighborhoods and walking. In the TIS, Mr. Caloggero assumed that new spaces would equal new trips. It is not new trips but that was what was assumed for the purposes of looking at the level of services at various intersections.

Commissioner Fetting commented that she struggles with the option of a new opening if there aren't any generated new trips associated with activity.

Mr. Weinberg believes that they will capture a bunch of the trips going down Park Avenue to the east coming up Elm Street that are taking a right on Park Avenue then cutting left onto the campus. He thinks it is redistribution. There will be some new trips. This is not for convenience it is to improve the flow on the campus and keep traffic away from where pedestrians are walking; it is for safety.

In response to Commission Fetting's question, Mr. John Verbus, Operations Officer stated that those people are parking on a campus that is 99% occupied and that in the future the goal is for the percentage of occupancy on parking to be 85%, so that people coming to the campus can find a parking spot. The additional 400 spaces provides some room to breathe with safe and easy access.

Commissioner Fetting said the total parking would be 1,659 after this improvement and asked how the 15% change was going to affect internal circulation.

Mr. Kleinhanzl stated that the hospital wanted open access in the back and that the northern quadrant of our campus is crowded. He stated that one cannot go by there on a weekday and not see cars parked on curbs around the surface parking lots. It is always congested. The 250 was a compromise and would have like to have seen it more from the start but a compromise but in order to move this in a direction he thinks helps balance the concerns of the neighbors and the needs of the hospital. He stated that this gets the hospital to where it needs to be with adequate parking on campus to prevent circulation problems.

Commissioner Fetting asked if there was ever consideration to build the garage on the big surface lot.

Mr. Kleinhanzl replied yes and that any additional expansion will need to be along that 7<sup>th</sup> Street corridor. But that the hospital would like to reserve it for a future building downstream which will require its own parking.

Mr. Severn asked Mr. Caloggero if he studied the intersection of 5<sup>th</sup> & Elm Street.

Mr. Caloggero responded no that they were not required to.

Mr. Severn asked what was used for a pick up or let out time for the Montessori School.

Mr. Caloggero studied the peak hours of 7-9 a.m. and 4-6 p.m. which is the streets peak hours.

Mr. Weinberg asked Mrs. Hahn if she was familiar with the TIS submitted by the Traffic Group dated December 2011.

Mrs. Hahn responded yes.

Mr. Weinberg asked in the TIS did Mr. Caloggero study every intersection that was requested to be studied.

Mrs. Hahn replied that all of the intersections that were in the scope were studied.

Mr. Weinberg asked if the study follows the methodology required by the City for a TIS for a site plan such as the one before the Planning Commission tonight.

Mrs. Hahn responded yes.

Mr. Weinberg asked if based on the results on this study, if this application was compliant with the provisions of the LMC.

Mrs. Hahn replied that they did follow the provisions of the LMC.

Mrs. Hahn added that the only intersection that was studied that was border-line unacceptable, is the intersection at 7<sup>th</sup> Street at the western most access and without the 250 trips going down to Park Avenue that would send 250 additional trips possibly to that intersection so a new TIS would be required to make sure that the 7<sup>th</sup> Street intersection can handle the additional traffic.

Commissioner Bokee asked what the possibility is of creating a separated access through drive that would connect to the entrance on the west side then would come down and link into the loading lot and then restricted access to some of the exits.

Mr. Geising replied that there is not enough distance located between the edge of where cardiac rehab area is and Park Avenue to put a driveway access there. He stated that there is just too much complication going on in that area.

Commissioner Nash asked if there was a requirement within the LMC that requires the applicant to have access to this street.

Mrs. Dunn stated that is correct; that the only requirement is that parking facilities over 100 spaces have multiple means of ingress and egress to the property.

Commissioner Bokee questioned if the Commission determines that the access point is denied, if that would trigger the denial of the entire site plan.

Mrs. Dunn responded that as it is proposed, yes. The other option, if the applicant were interested, is that they could request a continuance if they believe that the Commission would not vote in favor of it and look at proposing alternatives by addressing the comments expressed here and then allowing staff to review the proposal and bring it back before the Commission.

Commissioner Stup stated he was uncomfortable without having a study to know what is going to happen with 7<sup>th</sup> Street access point and rather than denying it, he would like to see what would happen to that intersection if there was an access on Park Avenue and if there was not.

Commissioner Fetting stated that that she doesn't believe that there are new trips and that's why she doesn't understand the huge concern about 7<sup>th</sup> Street because this doesn't represent new trips.

Mrs. Dunn stated that with the hospital, the intensity has increased and there hasn't been additions to the hospital so there has not been an application that has come forward that has warranted the TIS even

though more people are coming in and out. The purpose of this TIS is to establish a trip generation rate for parking space with the knowledge that the intensity has really increased over the years and that is what Staff is trying to capture because there are new trips as opposed to 10 years ago.

Commissioner Fetting stated that she cannot support the plan with the access point as it is and thinks that some further compromise on behalf of the hospital is needed and would like to see more work done with 7<sup>th</sup> Street more and maybe emergency only on Park Avenue.

Commissioner Nash concurred.

Alderman Russell asked if there has been any discussion with Hood College regarding some kind of an MOU to use Hood College.

Mr. Kleinhanzl replied that yes they did look at Hood College; that they had talked about expanding the garage towards the Hood campus and having a shared garage but there is a guideline that you cannot have two owners with one building so that plan was abandoned.

**RESTATEMENT/REVISION OF PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

There were no restatement/revisions from planning staff.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION FOR CONTINUANCE:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Fetting moved to continue PC11-597FSI for Frederick Memorial Hospital to the March Planning Commission Hearing and hold a special workshop hearing on February 13, 2012 to discuss revisions to the plan to reflect the testimony this evening.

**SECOND:** Alderman Russell.

**VOTE:** 5-0.

---

**E. PC11-804FSCB-Combined Forest Conservation Plan/Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan**

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Fetting moved to continue PC11-804FSCB for Frederick Memorial Hospital to the March 12, 2012 Planning Commission Hearing.

**SECOND:** Alderman Russell.

**VOTE:** 5-0.

---

**F. PC10-100ZTA-Zoning Text Amendment, Downtown Parking**

Mrs. Dunn stated that her intent was to bring this forward this evening as a workshop to go over the changes that have been made. She stated that the provision that applies specifically to the downtown stipulates that the minimum parking requirement does not apply to new buildings or addition to buildings that have a gross floor area of 40,000 square feet or less and are constructed on parcels that are zoned DB, DBO or M1 and are located in the area depicted in the figure in the staff report. Projects that did not meet those thresholds would still have the reduced parking requirements for those districts. She added that in addition to that change, a lot of the regulations have been consolidated to clean up the language and in doing so the transit availability has been moved to fall under the

downtown areas. She noted that one of the concerns about transit is that there is a 70% reduction in the requirement of parking if a project is within 500 feet of a Transit stop and staff feels that to be too great.

Commissioner Nash asked if the fee in lieu would be used in the downtown area as opposed to a transportation project.

Mrs. Dunn replied that the code states the fee is used in an area where new offsite parking improvements will benefit the applicants paying a fee in lieu of.

Mrs. Dunn stated that other changes include moving the section under bicycle parking which allows the number of vehicle spaces to be reduced by one for each five bicycle parking spaces to the general modifications in addition to the following:

- Clarifying that the shared use parking provision is not a modification; that it is a way to calculate parking.
- To include residential in the section for shared parking
- Clarifying how fee in lieu of factors in with regards to other parking modifications that can be granted

---

**E. PC11-781ZTA-Zoning Text Amendment, General Procedures & Site Plan Process**

Mrs. Dunn stated that staff is proposing to change the thresholds for staff level verses Planning Commission review authority for expansions. She stated that currently, it is a 1,000 square feet and if it is over 1,000 square feet it comes to the Planning Commission for an addition or expansion and that under the proposal this is changed to 5,000 square feet of land area or 25% or more of gross floor area. Staff is also changing the provisions which relate to revisions to site plan. Specifically, they are eliminating the one revision rule and instead, applying the provisions an increase of more than 10% of gross floor area or parking area. She stated that the the site plan expiration date is also being revised. That currently it is two years from water allocation or the date of approval which ever occurred later. That has been revised to say that the site plan will be valid for three years from the date of Planning Commission approval.

---

**GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Nash noted that Staff had mentioned a request regarding the Worman's Mill master plan and asked the nature of that request.

Mrs. Dunn replied that she received calls from some of the residents who spoke at the hearing asking if they could submit a petition to the Planning Commission to reconsider the application for the master plan. She stated that staff has looked at the Rules of Procedure and any party of record can submit a petition to the Planning Commission. The petition has to be made within 10 days of the final disposition of the Planning Commission's action on the matter.

---

**Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Carreanne Eyler  
Administrative Assistant